

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/917,897	OGAWA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Marjorie A. Moran	1631	

**All Participants:**

(1) Marjorie A. Moran.

(2) Mark Hayman.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 1 March 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*None*

**Claims discussed:**

*1-2*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*None*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

*Marjorie A. Moran*  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner stated that the response filed 2/18/05 and entered as "after-final" in the instant case actually appeared to be a preliminary amendment for a daughter case, and asked Mr. Hayman whether the response was intended to be an amendment for the instant appln. Mr. Hayman confirmed that the amendment was intended to be a preliminary amendment for a divisional of the instant case. As the pending and cancelled claims in the amendment do not "match" those pending in the instant case, the examiner said that she would mail a "non-responsive" type of Advisory Action with this Interview Summary in order to keep the record clear. She further stated that no action or response to this Interview was required of applicant for the instant case. Mr. Hayman indicated that he would refile the amendment for the divisional, removing any reference to an appln no., as none has yet been assigned to the daughter case, with the appropriate proof of mailing.